State of Michigan

Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan

For Submission to the
United States Department of Labor -
Division of Older Worker Programs

April 2004

2003-04 MICHIGAN SENIOR EMPLOYMENT SERVICES COORDINATION PLAN

Section 1. Plan Participation

Under Governor Jennifer Granholm employment assistance to help job seekers get into the workforce is an important priority. Michigan has initiated several innovative efforts to create employment opportunities and support a vibrant economy. Most notably, in 2004 Governor Granholm created the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (MDLEG) to promote job creation and economic growth by centralizing and streamlining the state's job, workforce, and economic development activities. The 2003-04 Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan (State Plan) is an excellent opportunity to compliment the economic and workforce development activities already underway in Michigan.

The Michigan Office of Services to the Aging (OSA) developed the initial draft of the State Plan. OSA is a Type I autonomous agency located in the Michigan Department of Community Health. OSA administers the Senior Community Services Employment Program (SCSEP) under an annual grant from the U.S. Department of Labor (US DoL).

In March 2004 the draft plan was submitted to MDLEG for review and comment. MDLEG is the lead agency in the state government for most employment assistance programs, including responsibility for the development of Michigan's Five-Year Workforce Investment Act (WIA) State Plan.

The State Plan was made available for review and comment on OSA's website (www.miseniors.net). The website allows any organization or individual with Internet access to comment on the plan from any location and at any time. OSA's website is highly visible and is one of the most frequently accessed websites in state government. The website has been "bobby" approved by the Center for Applied Special Technology (CAST) as accessible for individuals with disabilities. A wide variety of organizations that provide services to older adults were notified of the opportunity to comment on the State Plan.

OSA has had success using the website to publish other public documents, such as the Older American Act (OAA) Title III Three-Year State Plan, program and service reports, and Requests for Proposals (RFPs). Many individuals prefer this method of receiving documents as opposed to waiting for a paper copy to be mailed. OSA will provide paper copies of the draft plan, if requested. This option was included in announcements regarding the plan.

All public comments are summarized in section 3 and included in Appendix I.

Section 2. Involvement of Organizations and Individuals

a. The State Office on Aging and the Area Agencies on Aging (Grantees under title III of the OAA);

The Office of Services to the Aging developed the initial draft of the State Plan. OSA is the agency responsible for administration of the state's SCSEP grant. OSA's SCSEP projects operate in forty-seven of Michigan's eighty-three counties.

The Michigan SCSEP grant is administered locally through subgrants to area agencies on aging (AAAs). The AAA network is utilized because of the expertise of these organizations in providing supportive services to older persons. This expertise improves integration of SCSEP with other state and federal services, including OAA programs. As the oversight agency, OSA has a long history of working with AAAs to effectively deliver SCSEP and other services to older adults in the state.

A total of thirteen of the sixteen AAAs in the state receive a SCSEP grant from OSA. Each AAA subgrantee is required to sign an approvals and assurances document as part of the annual SCSEP subgrant application process. This document commits the subproject agency to adhere to all applicable federal and state statutes, rules, policies, and program goals.

AAAs were asked to provide review and comment on the State Plan. OSA discussed the draft plan and importance of AAA input during meetings with AAA SCSEP staff. AAA feedback is incorporated into the final version of the plan. OSA will work with AAA subgrantees as the plan is implemented in Michigan.

b. Workforce Investment Boards under the Workforce Investment Act (WIA);

OSA provided a copy of the draft plan to the MDLEG for input. MDLEG is the lead state agency in the development of Michigan's five-year WIA plan. OSA also provided a copy of the plan to Michigan Works! Inc. Michigan Works! is a workforce development association whose members includes workforce development boards (WDBs), local elected officials, and Michigan Works! agency directors from all of Michigan's twenty-five workforce areas. Both MDLEG and Michigan Works! work with the local one-stop centers and WDBs across the state. Input provided by MDLEG is included in Appendix I.

c. Public and private nonprofit agencies and organizations providing employment services, including each SCSEP grantee operating in the State;

In January 2004 the seven national sponsors administering SCSEP projects in Michigan were surveyed as part of the State Plan development process. The survey gathered information on current program participants, SCSEP services, OAA section 502(e) projects, and coordination with WIA programs. Survey responses have been

aggregated and incorporated in the draft plan. A copy of the State Plan survey is attached in Appendix II. A list of the national sponsor organizations administering SCSEP projects in Michigan is attached in Appendix VI.

OSA has utilized surveys to gather information from national SCSEP sponsors on a number of occasions, including the development of the annual Equitable Distribution Report (EDR). Surveys work well because several of the national sponsors operating in Michigan have administrative offices located outside of the state.

In addition to the survey, national SCSEP sponsors were notified of the opportunity to comment on the draft plan.

OSA worked closely with Operation ABLE of Michigan on the development of the plan and the survey of national sponsors. Operation ABLE is a highly regarded nonprofit provider of employment and training services, including training programs tailored to older job seekers. Located in southeast Michigan, Operation ABLE has close linkages with a large number of employers and job training programs in the state.

OSA provided a copy of the draft plan to Operation ABLE for review. Comments from Operation ABLE are summarized in section 3 and included in Appendix I.

d. Other organizations including business and labor, community-based service organizations, social service agencies that service older individuals, SCSEP participants, and other interested organizations.

OSA staff attend and provide input at meetings of the state-level Michigan Workforce Investment Board (MWIB). The MWIB oversees workforce development activities as required by WIA. OSA has offered its assistance to the MWIB on matters concerning services to older job seekers. Members of the MWIB include representatives of business, labor, education, state government, local government, one-stop partners, and employment assistance and training programs.

Notice of the opportunity to comment on the plan was sent to the Michigan Directors of Services to the Aging (MDSA). MDSA is made up of a wide variety of agencies that deliver OAA title III and other state, federal, and local services to older adults in Michigan. Several MDSA agencies also serve as host sites for SCSEP participants.

OSA notified subgrantees and national program sponsors in the state of the opportunity for SCSEP participants to provide input on the draft plan.

Section 3. Public Comments

Public comments on the plan included support for and clarification on several topics discussed in the plan. A summary of public comment is included below. A record of all public comment is attached in Appendix I.

Pubic Comment Summary

Source: Operation ABLE of Michigan:

The senior employment coordination plan is an excellent summary of the SCSEP activities in the Michigan. Additional coordination activities involving SCSEP are: the *Ability is Ageless* Job Fair, *Ability is Ageless* Award Luncheon, *Older Worker Think Tank*, and work on the *Reshaping Michigan's Workforce, An Action Plan for the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth*.

Source: Area Agency on Aging 1-B (AAA 1-B)

AAA 1-B:

- Is pleased to learn that OSA will continue to place priority on Equitable Distribution Report (EDR) and service to underserved counties.
- Acknowledges the work done to target the program to individuals in greatest need and meet the 20% outplacement mandate.
- Agrees with the recommendation that recognizes the value of the program in the provision of community service.
- Supports multi-year funding and provisions to allow carry over of Title V funds.

Source: Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth (MDLEG)

MDLEG provided clarification on the following references/statements in the plan:

- One-Stop Career Centers should be referred to as Michigan Works! Service Centers.
- Michigan Works! (workforce development association) should be referred to as the Michigan Works! Association.
- The "identification of strategies to address the aging population" is a goal or tactic rather than a trend.
- Subsidized community host agency placement data do not include a category for Michigan Works! Service Centers (MWSCs).
- The SCSEP plan should also indicate that all 25 workforce development boards in Michigan have MOUs with one or more SCSEP grantees.
- WIA regulations contain minimum requirements for OJT contracts. Michigan did not mandate a common format in addition to the WIA specifications. This is left to the discretion of the local WDBs.

NOTE - Comments received on the coordination plan after March 30, 2004 will be submitted to US DoL in an addendum to the April 2004 version of the plan.

Section 4. State Plan Provisions

a. Basic Distribution of SCSEP Positions

The distribution of SCSEP resources is reviewed and updated annually by OSA and national program sponsors operating in the state. Based on this review, OSA submits the EDR to US DoL on an annual basis. The EDR compares the location of subsidized SCSEP positions with county-specific position targets established by US DoL. This process is intended to ensure adequate program coverage across the state. Table 1 identifies the number of underserved counties in Michigan according the 2003-04 EDR. The complete Michigan EDR is attached in Appendix III.

Table 1a. Equitable Distribution Report 2002 & 2003

Program Year	Counties Served at EDR-Recommend Level	EDR Underserved Counties
2002-03	59	24
2003-04	47	36

Source: 2002-03 & 2003-04 Michigan SCSEP EDR

Table 1b. Analysis of EDR Underserved Counties 2003-04

Of the total of 36 underserved counties:	
The number of counties underserved by 2 positions or less:	20
The number of counties underserved by 5 positions or less:	29

Source: 2002-03 & 2003-04 Michigan SCSEP EDR

In June 2003 OSA provided subgrantees with an analysis of the distribution of SCSEP positions and EDR targets. Subgrantees were directed to make future changes in position allocations in accordance with EDR targets. Additionally, OSA allocated all additional authorized positions in program years 2002 and 2003 to underserved counties. In February 2004 OSA reallocated five vacant positions to underserved areas. OSA will work with SCSEP sponsors in the state that receive approval from US DoL to move positions to do so in support of EDR targets.

In addition to the EDR, national SCSEP sponsors in the state were surveyed and asked to identify significantly underserved or over-served counties and/or communities, and to describe strategies to increase service levels in underserved areas. A summary of the responses is provided in Table 2.

Table 2. Equitable Distribution Strategies

▪ In Detroit and Wayne County there is a large population of potential program participants. Recruitment efforts have been focused on low-income seniors that want unsubsidized employment. Recruiting has also been initiated in the Hispanic community in southwest Detroit. This population is under-represented in SCSEP in Detroit. Connections with the Hispanic community will help better serve the Hispanic low-income seniors. Marketing efforts appear to be working, especially considering the large number of senior centers in the area and the close proximity to the Michigan Family Independence Agency's (FIA) senior services office.
▪ Oakland County is underserved, especially the southeastern portion of the county. Marketing has begun in this area to let potential participants and host agencies know that SCSEP is available.
▪ Genesee County enrollment has been maximized and demand for the program continues to grow.
▪ Periodic reports on project areas with enrollment vacancies are needed. Position can be re-allocated to underserved areas with waiting lists.
▪ Locate SCSEP offices in close proximity to "underserved "areas. Many participants lack transportation and may find it difficult to locate adequate public transportation. Marketing the program may create program demand in excess of authorized positions in areas where the program is being marketed (e.g., Oakland County).

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

As a preface to sections 4b, c, d, and e of the draft plan, some of the data elements are available from the 2000 Census (e.g., most socio-economic data). In some cases, data from other sources and/or proxy measures have been included, where relevant. For example, OSA surveyed national sponsors to collect data on services to special populations as part of the plan development process. Survey respondents indicated that the following populations were most in need of SCSEP services:

- Disabled Individuals - Projects are working with vocational rehabilitation to enroll and place disabled individuals

- Veterans - There is a significant veteran population in some areas. Projects work with Veteran Affairs and local Veteran Centers

- The "Elderly" - The older segment of the SCSEP-eligible population and those with chronic illnesses

Similarly, a review was conducted of a recent summary of WDB strategic plans. Emerging trends include identifying strategies to address an aging population. A large number of boards identified this as a "most prominent emerging trend." The five-year WIA plan was reviewed, as well as the minimum standards for one-stop centers, which discuss information and referral services for older workers.

b. Rural and Urban Populations

The 2000 Census provides population figures on individuals residing in rural areas. Analysis on census-designated rural populations indicates that one-quarter of the state's residents reside in rural areas. Based on the EDR distribution of SCSEP positions, Michigan projects allocate 28.4 percent of all positions (568 positions) to counties where 50 percent or more residents reside in census-designated rural areas. If

the percentage of <u>all</u> persons in Michigan residing in rural areas (25.3 percent) is applied to the total number of EDR allocated positions for 2003-04 (2002 positions), a baseline of 507 positions should be located in rural areas. Currently, Michigan is exceeding this baseline by sixty-one positions.

In fifteen of the twenty-eight counties in the state where 10 percent or more of the fifty-five and older population is below poverty, more than 80 percent of county residents reside in rural areas. Michigan SCSEP projects allocate 136 positions to these areas (6.8 percent of all positions in 2003). Residents in these counties make up only 3.6 percent of the state's fifty-five and older population.   More detailed information on rurality in Michigan is attached in Appendix IV.

A proxy measure of services to non-rural individuals was developed from census data and the location of SCSEP positions across counties in the state. Based on the 2003-04 EDR, Michigan projects allocate 61.3 percent of all program positions (1228 positions) to counties where less than one-third of residents reside in census-designated rural areas. If the percentage of non-rural persons in counties where two-thirds or more county residents reside in non-rural areas is applied to the total number of EDR positions for 2003-04, a baseline of 1217 positions should be located in these "urban" counties. Currently, Michigan is exceeding this baseline by eleven positions.

In Wayne County, where 99.3 percent of all residents are urban and 13.1 percent of the fifty-five and over population is below the federal poverty level (FPL), SCSEP projects allocate 595 positions (29.7 percent of all positions in 2003-04). This level of service reflects the high concentration of SCSEP-eligible individuals in Wayne County.

Further clarification is needed from US DoL regarding the definition of urban and rural for SCSEP purposes. The proxy measures outlined above utilize a U.S. Census definition of rural residency status. Future data collection efforts will need to include more detailed data on rural isolation and services to urban populations.

c. Special Populations:

(1) "Greatest economic need" means those persons at or below the poverty level established by the Department of Health and Human Services and approved by the Office of Management and Budget;

(2) "Minorities" include: American Indian or Alaskan Native, Asians, Black or African Americans, Hispanic or Latino Americans, and Native Hawaiian or Other Pacific Islanders,

(3) "Greatest social need" means needs caused by non-economic factors. It includes persons with physical and mental disabilities; language barriers; and cultural, social, or geographic isolation, including isolation brought about by racial or ethnic status.

In general, all OAA services, including SCSEP, target special populations. Pursuant to Section 307(a)(8) of the OAA and Federal Register Section 1321.17(8), "Outreach efforts shall place special emphasis on reaching older individuals with the greatest economic or social needs with particular attention to low-income, minority individuals." OSA utilizes a variety of data sources, including figures from the U.S Census Bureau and the Michigan Aging Information System, to assure adequate service levels to special populations.

Demographic data on service recipients is compiled for the SCSEP QPR and the OAA title III services report (i.e., National Aging Program Information System - State Program Report [NAPIS SPR]).   According to the 2003 NAPIS SPR and SCSEP QPR data, Michigan served significant percentages of minority persons in OAA title III and title V (SCSEP) services. Table 3 provides an overview of the demographic distribution of Michigan's 60+ population, and service levels for OAA title III and SCSEP services.

Table 3. 2002 Older Americans Act Service Title III & V (SCSEP) Data

Population Characteristics	Michigan* 60+ Population	% Michigan 60+ Population	2003 OAA Title III Services (% Total Clients Served)**	Title V / SCSEP Participants (2002 - 03)
Total 60+ Population	1,596,162		28.1%	Total Authorized SCSEP Positions: 2003
White, Non-Hispanic	1,400,703	87.6%	14.9%	56.8%
African American	160,741	10.1%	31.1%	38.0%
Hispanic	18,653	1.2%	33.6%	3.5%
Asian/Pacific Islander	12,298	0.8%	10.6%	0.8%
Native American/Alaskan	4,658	0.3%	49.7%	1.0%
Low-Income	264,800	16.6%	33.7%	70.9%

*Source: 2000 U.S. Census
**Percent served refers to the minority population that was served by OAA registered services (e.g., the number of African Americans 60+ served in Michigan in FY 2003 by OAA services equaled 31 percent of the total Michigan African American 60+ population)

4c (1) Greatest Economic Need

Figures from the 2000 Census indicate that 8.7 percent of persons fifty-five years of age and older in Michigan were below FPL. QPR data on Michigan SCSEP participants for program 2003-04 suggest that a large number are at or below FPL and considered at "greatest economic need." In the most recently completed program year (2002-03) nearly three-quarters of SCSEP participants were at or below FPL. This percentage is much larger than the percentage of SCSEP-eligible persons below FPL in Michigan. This is significant in light of SCSEP criteria that limit eligibility to those at or below 125 percent of FPL.

Of the twenty counties in the state (33.7 percent of all counties) where 10 percent or more of residents fifty-five and older are below FPL, SCSEP projects allocated 873 positions (43.6 percent of the total for 2002-03).

Table 4 provides figures on the distribution of SCSEP participants at or below FPL for program years 2000 to 2002. Information on persons fifty-five and older with income below FPL for all Michigan counties is included in Appendix V.

Table 4. Michigan SCSEP Participants at or below Federal Poverty (2000 – 2002)

SCSEP Participants	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03
Percentage at or below Federal Poverty Level	69.9%	72.2%	70.9%

Source: SCSEP Michigan Quarterly Program Reports

SCSEP sponsors operating in Michigan were asked to describe efforts underway to increase participation by economically disadvantaged individuals. A summary of survey responses is shown in Table 5.

Table 5. SCSEP Strategies to Attract/Serve to Low-Income Participants

▪ Recruitment efforts continue in SCSEP service areas. Posters and information placed in agencies/offices where food stamps, public assistance, and employment services are available. Flyers are posted in church mailings and grocery stores, and the program is marketed through newspaper and radio advertisements.
▪ Group presentations are made at One-Stop Career Centers, GED education centers, ESL classes, senior centers and at FIA offices. FIA workers have been notified that they can refer low-income seniors to SCSEP for assistance.
▪ SCSEP projects have focused on serving the "oldest of the old and poorest of the poor." A large number of SCSEP enrollees in Michigan have less than high school education and/or have incomes at or below poverty. Priority is given to such individuals.

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

4c (2) Minorities

Participation rates for minorities are an important measure of services to special populations. OSA and national SCSEP sponsors compile demographic data on program participants on a quarterly basis. Data from 2003-04 indicates that minority individuals make up nearly 40 percent of SCSEP participants. This compares with the total sixty and older population in Michigan of which 12.3 percent are minorities. This suggests that SCSEP serves a higher percentage of minority individuals than the percentage of minorities in the overall SCSEP target population. Table 6 provides a breakdown of minority participation in Michigan SCSEP projects from 2000 to 2003.

Table 6. Minority SCSEP Participation - Program Years 2000 – 2003

Participant Race / Ethnicity	2000-01	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04*
White (Non-Hispanic)	59.4%	57.4%	56.7 %	60.4 %
African American	34.7%	36.5%	38.0%	34.4%
Hispanic	3.7%	4.0%	3.5%	3.8%
American Indian / Native Alaskan	1.1%	0.8%	0.8%	0.6%
Asian/Pacific Islander	1.1%	1.3%	1.0%	0.8%
Total Percentage Minority Participants:	40.6%	42.6%	43.3%	39.6 %

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

A review of SCSEP QPR data and survey responses from Michigan program sponsors indicates that while a significant number of participants are minorities, projects continue to employ strategies to ensure minority participation. Examples include:

- Using posters, flyers, newspaper and radio advertisements, and faith-based publications to market the program to minority individuals

- Utilizing bilingual case managers to conduct outreach in the disadvantaged Hispanic community

- Coordinating program outreach with a cultural/ethnic/religious community centers to increase participation of low-income seniors that visit the centers

- Contacting senior centers to attract Arabic/Chaldean participants in ESL classes

4c (3) Greatest Social Need

Data on services to individuals at the "greatest social need" are not readily available under current QPR requirements. According to survey data collected from SCSEP sponsors in Michigan in January 2004, the following non-economic, social need factors were most frequently cited as those that impact the SCSEP-eligible population.

Table 7. Non-Economic Social Need Factors

Need Factor	Rank
Physical and/or mental disabilities	1
Geographical isolation	2
Language barriers	3
Cultural/ethnic/ social isolation	4

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

Another important consideration in terms of the effectiveness of service delivery to special populations is the percentage SCSEP participants that identify themselves as disabled. According to SCSEP data for the most recently completed program year (2002-03) 15.6 percent of participants in Michigan indicated that they were disabled. Data through January 2004 indicates that 18.9 percent of current year participants are disabled. SCSEP services to disabled individuals can be viewed against 2000 Census figures for Michigan that indicates that 9.9 percent of disabled individuals between the ages of twenty-one and sixty-four are employed.

Another factor to be considered when planning service delivery to meet the needs of the disabled is data from the census that show that individuals with a census-defined disability make up approximately 42.3 percent of the state's sixty-five and older population. This figure rises to 54.4 percent for individuals seventy-five and older. This trend highlights the importance of ensuring the accessibility of SCSEP to the disabled since 60 percent of participants in 2002-03 were over the age of sixty-five and 18 percent were over the age of seventy-five.

Other factors indicating social need include racial and ethnic factors, language barriers, and social barriers. Data on race and ethnicity for the SCSEP-eligible population in Michigan are included in Table 6. These figures show that minorities participate in SCSEP at higher levels than their percentage in the state's older population as a whole.

In terms of language barriers, according to the U.S. Census 1.5 percent of persons forty-five and older in Michigan households that speak a language other than English are considered to be isolated due to language. This suggests that SCSEP should serve at least thirty individuals who are identified as isolated due to a language barrier (i.e., 1.5 percent of 2002 positions in 2003-04). Clarification is needed from U.S. DoL regarding the definition of "cultural/ethnic" and "linguistic" isolation. Currently, "language spoken in the home" and "linguistic isolation" are not required data elements for SCSEP reporting purposes. Future data collection efforts will need to include these characteristics.

Based on the survey responses summarized in Table 7, SCSEP sponsors identified linguistic and cultural/ethnic isolation as the third and fourth most frequently cited non-economic, social need factors behind disability and geographic isolation.

4c Services to Veterans

Data for program years 2001 to 2003 indicate that veterans made up approximately 10 percent of all program participants in each of the last three program years. This can be viewed in light of census figures that indicate that 12.4 percent of the eighteen and older population in Michigan are veterans. Table 8 shows data on participation by veterans since program year 2001.

Table 8. Michigan SCSEP Service to Veterans (2001 – 2003)

SCSEP Participants*	2001-02	2002-03	2003-04**
Percentage of Participants who are Veterans	9.9%	11.8%	10.4%

Source: SCSEP Michigan Quarterly Program Reports
** State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

d. Type of Skills

An important source of employment training for SCSEP participants as they progress though the program is subsidized community placement. These placements are based on the employment goals and skill needs outlined in the participant's employment plan. Table 9 provides a profile of the subsidized community host agency placements for 2002-03.

Table 9. SCSEP Subsidized Placements PY 2002-03

Services to the General Community	% 2002-03 Placements	Services to the Elderly Community	% 2002-03 Placements
Education	21.6%	Project Administration	15.1%
Health & Hospitals	10.6%	Health & Home Care	4.8%
Housing Rehabilitation	3.7%	Housing Rehabilitation	7.8%
Employment Assistance	2.1%	Employment Assistance	1.4%
Recreation / Parks & Forests	7.9%	Recreation / Senior Centers	28.0%
Environmental Quality	1.7%	Nutrition Programs	21.8%
Public Works	4.1%	Transportation	1.3%
Social Services	33.7%	Outreach / Referral	7.2%
Other	14.6%	Other	12.6 %

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

In addition to subsidized placement, SCSEP regulations allow for employment training to be provided to program participants under section 502(e) of the OAA. Section 502(e) training projects are intended to be consistent with the participant's unsubsidized employment goals, and:

- Provide SCSEP participants with career training and placement opportunities with private businesses;

- Facilitate the achievement of economic self-sufficiency for participants; and

- Provides SCSEP projects with opportunities to initiate/enhance relationships with the private sector, collaborate with the one-stops, meet or exceed performance standards, and broaden the options available to SCSEP participants.

More than one-half of State Plan survey respondents indicated that their SCSEP sub-projects utilize Section 502(e) projects as a way to transition enrollees to unsubsidized employment.

Table 10. Utilization of OAA Section 502(e) in Michigan

Do your SCSEP projects utilize Section 502(e)?	Yes	No
Percentage	60%	40%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

The success of the program in transitioning participants from subsidized training assignments to private employment hinges in large part on developing and enhancing employment skills that are in demand in growth industries and occupations. Table 11 identifies the employment skills that were most frequently reported as present in the 2003-04 Michigan SCSEP population. Table 12 identifies the job training provided to current year SCSEP participants.

Table 11. Job Skills Present in 2003-04 Michigan SCSEP Population

Skill Area	Rank
Basic Clerical	1
Library/Teachers/Tutors	2
Receptionist	3
Food Service	4
Customer Service	5 (tie)
Custodial	5 (tie)
Child Care	5 (tie)
Computer/Information Technology	6
Secretary	7 (tie)
Security	7 (tie)
Transportation	8
Health Aides	9
Administrative/ Program Assistant	10

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

Table 12. Training & Skill Development Provided to 2003-04 Michigan SCSEP Participants

Skill Area	Rank
Job Search Skills	1
Library/Teachers/Tutors	2
Basic Clerical	3
Health Aides	4
Child Care	5 (tie)
Receptionist	5 (tie)
Custodial	6
Customer Service	7
Food Service	8
Computer/Information Technology	9

Source: 2003-04 State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

Employment skills that are either present or are being developed in the SCSEP population can be viewed against recent employment and wage estimates, and forecasts of the occupations that will be in demand in Michigan in the next few years. Tables 13 provides employment and wage information for 2002. Table 14 lists occupations with strong projected job growth and favorable employment levels.

Table 13. 2002 Michigan Employment & Wage Estimates

Occupational Title	Employment	Average Hourly Wage (Estimate)	Occupational Title	Employment	Average Hourly Wage (Estimate)
Sales & Related Occupations	700,030	$15.30	Management Occupations	173,660	$42.87
Installation, Maintenance, & Repair Occupations	529,280	$18.77	Architecture & Engineering Occupations	144,260	$30.07
Personal Care & Service Occupations	469,590	$10.66	Food Preparation & Servicing Related Occupations	137,560	$8.28
Protective Service Occupations	361,340	$15.14	Healthcare Support Occupations	115,600	$11.11
Production Occupations	303,080	$16.73	Building & Grounds Cleaning & Maintenance Occupations	99,130	$11.00
Transportation & Material Moving Occupations	303,080	$13.82	Computer & Mathematical Occupations	77,560	$28.13
Education, Training, & Library Occupations	246,770	$20.86	Arts, Design, Entertainment, Sports, & Media Occupations	51,460	$22.48
Healthcare Practitioners & Technical Occupations	217,070	$27.16	Community & Social Services Occupations	39,710	$17.70
Farming, Fishing, & Forestry Occupations	189,130	$9.82	Life, Physical, & Social Sciences Occupations	35,440	$22.96
Business & Financial Operations Occupations	181,180	$27.22	Legal Occupations	25,490	$35.08
Construction & Extraction Occupations	175,110	$20.27	Office & Administrative Support Occupations	7,060	$13.72

Source: Michigan Department of Labor & Economic Growth, Career Development, Office of Labor Market Information

Table 14. Michigan Critical Occupations – Job Openings

Rank	Occupation	Growth	Openings	Rank	Occupation	Growth	Openings
1	General Managers & Executives	11.7%	2814	6	Engineer / Nat Science / Computer / Information System Mgrs	35.7%	701
2	Systems Analysts	92.6%	2289	7	Mechanical Engineers	19.6%	604
3	Computer Support Specialists	90.3%	1113	8	Electrical & Electronics Engineers	30.5%	443
4	Computer Programmers	18.8%	1052	9	Advertising / Marketing / Promotions / Sales Mgrs	17.6%	491
5	Computer Engineers	100.8%	954	10	Designers, Exterior / Interior	19.4%	626

Source: Michigan Department of Labor & Economic Growth, Career Development, Office of Labor Market Information

d. Community Service Needs. The term "community service" means social, health, welfare, and educational services (including literacy tutoring), legal and other counseling services, and library, recreational, conservation, maintenance, or restoration of natural resources; community betterment or beautification; antipollution and environmental quality efforts; weatherization activities; economic development; and other services essential and necessary to the community as the State may determine.

OSA surveyed SCSEP sponsors in January 2004 as to the projects most needed in communities served by the program. Table 15 displays the percentage of SCSEP sponsors in Michigan that identified the areas listed as "community service needs" in the areas that they serve.

Table 15. Community Service Needs

Services to General Community:	Percent	Services to Elder Community	Percent
Education	100%	Health or Home Care	100%
Social Service	100%	Recreation/Senior Centers	100%
Health and Hospitals	80%	Outreach and Referral	80%
Recreation/Parks & Recreation	40%	Project Administration	60%
Housing/Home Rehabilitation	20%	Housing/Home Rehabilitation	40%
Employment Assistance	20%	Employment Assistance	40%
Environmental Quality	20%	Nutrition Programs	40%
Public Works	20%	Other: Adult Day Care	20%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

SCSEP participants assigned to community service agencies are an important support to the network of agencies that address community service needs. A review of the current distribution of community service assignments noted in Table 9 suggest that these agencies serve a wide variety of the areas identified as community needs in Table 15. This is a good source of information for the state and other program sponsors to consider when allocating positions to community host agencies.

f. Coordination with the Workforce Investment Act (WIA).

It is the intent of OSA that area agencies on aging collaborate with workforce development boards (WBDs) and one-stop centers to assure that the needs of older persons are represented. At the local level, subprojects have established a multitude of cooperative and collaborative relationships with human service provider agencies. Linkages have been developed with community action agencies, one-stop centers, vocational rehabilitation offices, WDBs, county multi-purpose human services collaborative bodies, and county councils or commissions on aging.

OSA requires all subgrantees, as a part of their annual grant application, to describe their involvement with WDBs and one-stop centers. Examples of current coordination efforts by OSA subgrantees include:

Table 16. OSA-WIA Coordination Efforts

▪ Holding bi-monthly meetings with SCSEP national sponsors and WIB members and one-stop center staff
▪ Assigning SCSEP enrollees to one-stop centers to provide assistance to older job seekers
▪ Contract agreements to provide training services for WIA participants
▪ Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) in place with one-stop centers
▪ Referrals to WIA one-stops and vice-versa depending on the employment assistance needed by the job seeker
▪ SCSEP staff participates with workforce board (WIB) in the region. SCSEP services are collocated at one-stops centers

Source: OSA subgrantee applications – June 2003

SCSEP national sponsors operating in the state were surveyed regarding WIA and asked to describe overall coordination with WIA, coordination with one-stop centers, and the number of MOUs in place with one-stop centers. Table 17 summarizes the

level of coordination with WIA for SCSEP sponsors in Michigan.

Table 17. SCSEP Coordination with Workforce Investment Act Programs

Overall Coordination w/ WIA Programs:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
Close coordination with programs	0%
Some coordination with programs	71%
Little coordination between programs	29%
No coordination between programs	0%
Involvement w/ One-Stop Career Centers:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
Involved in most One-Stop Career Centers	0%
Involved in some One-Stop Career Centers	57%
Involved in very few One-Stop Career Centers	43%
Not involved in One-Stop Career Centers	0%
Development of Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with One-Stop Career Centers:	% of Michigan SCSEP Sponsors
MOUs w/ most One-Stop Career Centers	0%
MOUs w/ some One-Stop Career Centers	43%
MOUs w/ very few One-Stop Career Centers	43%
No MOUs w/ One-Stop Career Centers	14%

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

Survey respondents also submitted suggestions for better coordination with WIA, and provided examples of recent coordination efforts in their service areas. Survey responses are summarized in Table 18.

Table 18. SCSEP – WIA Coordination Strategies

Suggestions for better coordination with WIA:
▪ Hold training events with one-stop centers in Detroit and Oakland County for seniors how to conduct a job search
▪ Make more referrals made to one-stop centers for resume and job search assistance
▪ Receive information from US DoL regarding WIA and the coordination of WIA services with SCSEP
▪ More of an emphasis in WIA on servicing older adults and balancing WIA goals with the employment goals of older adults (e.g., full-time employment as a WIA performance goals versus older adults wanting to work part-time)
▪ Provide more information needed on serving older adults
Examples of current SCSEP efforts to coordinate with WIA:
▪ On-going referrals to WIA programs for job search, including registering on the Talent Bank
▪ On-going contact between SCSEP staff and WIA staff
▪ Asking WIA providers to conduct job search training seminars for SCSEP participants
▪ Referrals from WIA to SCSEP, SCSEP presentations at WIA meetings, and presentations by WIA at local SCSEP meetings

Source: State Coordination Plan Survey - January 2004

g. Avoidance of Disruptions

See plan section 4a for a discussion on position allocations in Michigan.

Section 5. State Plan Recommendations

In this section, the Governor may make recommendations to the Secretary of Labor on actions to be taken by SCSEP grantees in the State to improve SCSEP services. The recommendations may include such topics as the location of positions, the types of community services, the time required to make changes in the distribution of positions, and the types of enrollees to be enrolled. If recommendations are provided, they should reflect the items discussed in Section 4, above, Plan Provisions. They should also be realistic recommendations that the Secretary may consider.

1) Multi-Year Program Funding

Current funding for SCSEP is based upon a program year that runs from July 1st through June 30th of the following year. Unlike OAA title III funding, SCSEP does not allow funds to be carried over from one program year to the next, unless a formal extension is approved. The inability to carry funds forward creates problems at year-end, as this is an arbitrary deadline in terms of employment activities. For example, organizations looking to enter into an On-The-Job Training (OJT) or Work Experience (WE) contract with SCSE programs do not recognize fiscal year demarcations. These organizations are looking to train an individual for a position to meet a business need. Multi-Year funding or an ability to carry-over some portion of the program year grant would allow SCSEP projects to enter into employment arrangements with prospective employers that are designed to meet the needs of the enrollee and the employer.

2) Standardized OAA 502(e) Contract Forms

The section 502(e) option under the federal OAA is a useful tool for enhancing the placement capabilities of SCSEP. This is especially true as states across the country implement the WIA. In order to facilitate partnerships between and among WIA programs and streamline these programs, thought should be given to creating boilerplate language for OJT and WE contracts for all WIA programs.

The boilerplate language could be enhanced and made more agency/program-specific, but all programs under WIA would have the basic minimums that should be included in all OJT/WE agreements. The boilerplate contract language should be based upon best practices of current SCSEP and other WIA programs that are successfully utilizing OJTs and other cooperative arrangements to provide employment assistance and job placement services.

3) SCSEP sponsors in Michigan suggested the following program recommendations:

    I. Section 502(e) funds should be more readily available (e.g., JTPA Older Adult Employment), and the program should have the ability to "carry" funding across fiscal years.

II. More administrative funding is needed. This is a labor-intensive program that requires a great deal of one-on-one contact with the participants. For example, case managers conduct two job searches: one for the best host agency assignment and a second for the unsubsidized placement. Payroll is also a labor-intensive process that requires constant follow-up. Many participants have been out of the labor market for quite some time and need a lot of assistance with basic work requirements.

III. More direction/clarification from US DoL on balancing "non-countable" SCSEP income (e.g., food stamps, federal housing and certain social services benefits) with unsubsidized placement goals. Non-countable income can create a disincentive for participants to transition to unsubsidized employment.

IV. Emphasize the importance of community service and the needs of seniors, not just placement numbers.

V. Hold a state-level meeting with US DoL in attendance to discuss program issues and share information.

VI. Hold training events to bring SCSEP projects together to discuss coordination activities, share information, and discuss common problems.

<u>**Michigan Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan**</u>

Section 3. Public Comments.

Source: Operation ABLE of Michigan

The Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan provides an excellent summary of the SCSEP program undertaken in the State of Michigan. An additional coordination activity that involves SCSEP agencies, WIA providers and employers is the Ability is Ageless Job Fair. This job fair brings together agencies in southeast Michigan that deal with older job seekers as well as area employers who value the contribution mature workers can make in their workforces. Employers can also recognize older workers at the Annual Ability is Ageless Award Luncheon held each year to recognize exemplary older workers, and participate at the annual Think Tank that deals with a topic of interest concerning an aging workforce. Future coordination and awareness initiatives will be undertaken as a result of the *Reshaping Michigan's Workforce, An Action Plan for the Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth*. This report released in February of 2004 identifies older workers as a target population to address in the WIA State plan.

Source: Region 1B Area Agency on Aging

Thank you for the opportunity to provide review and comment on the FY 2005 Michigan Office of Services to the Aging (OSA) State Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan.

The Area Agency on Aging 1-B (AAA 1-B) was pleased to learn that OSA will continue to provide placement priority to Equitable Distribution Report (EDR) underserved counties. The AAA 1-B was very fortunate to receive two additional placements in FY 2003-2004. We recognize that in Region 1-B, Oakland and Macomb continue to be EDR underserved counties.

In addition, we acknowledge the work done to target the program to individuals in greatest social and economic need yet still meet the 20% outplacement mandate. We agree with the recommendation that recognizes the value of the program in the provision of community service, which is equally important to the requirement for outplacement of enrollees.

We support the recommendation of multi-year funding and a provision to allow for carry over of Title V funds. We believe this flexibility would support long-term 502(e) and other outplacement projects that do not always fall within the current fiscal year constraints.

Thank you for the opportunity to provide input into the plan. If you have questions, or would like further input, please do not hesitate to contact me.

Source: Michigan Department of Labor and Economic Growth

General Comments

For the purpose of consistency within all the various state plans submitted to the U.S. Department of Labor, Michigan's One-Stop Career Centers should be referred to as Michigan Works! Service Centers throughout the SCSEP Plan.

Michigan Works!, the workforce development association, should be referred to as the Michigan Works! Association rather than Michigan Works! Inc.

Section 4b. Basic Distribution of SCSEP Positions

The second paragraph on Page 5 refers to "identifying strategies to address an aging population" as an emerging trend indicated in a recent summary of workforce development board strategic plans. The second sentence of the paragraph should read as follows: Emerging trends include an aging population.

The "identification of strategies to address the aging population" would be considered a goal or tactic rather than a trend.

Section 4d. Types of Skills

Table 9 provides a profile of the subsidized community host agency placements. Which category includes the Michigan Works! Service Centers (MWSCs)? Should the MWSCs be identified separately in future surveys?

Section 4f. Coordination with the Workforce Investment Act (WIA)

Table 17 details the percentage of SCSEP Sponsors having MOUs with One-Stop Centers. The Workforce Investment Act mandates that local workforce development boards enter into MOUs with one-stop partners, including programs authorized under Title V of the Older Americans Act of 1965. Therefore, the SCSEP plan should also indicate that all 25 workforce development boards in Michigan have MOUs with one or more Senior Community Service Agencies. Title V grantee MOU signatories include:

- Green Thumb
- Area Agencies on Aging
- AARP Foundation
- National Indian Council on Aging
- U.S. Forest Service
- National Senior Citizens Education & Research Centers
- National Urban League

Section 5. State Plan Recommendations

Recommendation 2) of Section 5 regarding Standardized OAA 502(e) Contract Forms proposes enhanced, more agency/program-specific boilerplate language for On-The-Job Training and Work Experience (OJT/WE) agreements. The Workforce Investment Act regulations contain minimum requirements for OJT contracts. The State did not mandate a common format in addition to the specifications of the WIA regulations, but left this to the discretion of the local workforce development boards.

MICHIGAN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY HEALTH
OFFICE OF SERVICES TO THE AGING

2003/2004 STATE SENIOR EMPLOYMENT SERVICES COORDINATION PLAN

NATIONAL SPONSOR SCSEP PROJECT SURVEY

Name:	Address:
Agency:	City, State, Zip;
Phone No.	Email:

JANUARY 2004

2003/2004 Michigan Senior Services Employment Coordination Plan Survey

The Reauthorization of the Older Americans Act in 2000 brought with it changes to the Senior Community Service Employment Program (SCSEP). One change is the requirement that each state develop a State Senior Employment Services Coordination Plan. Input from national SCSEP sponsors operating in each state is an important component of the plan. To help us develop the plan, please consider the following State Coordination Plan questions.

1. Please describe your SCSEP enrollee population as of December 31, 2003 according to the criteria below:

Participant Information	Number
Total allotment of positions authorized this year	
Number of positions filled	
Number on waiting list	
Number of participants at or below the poverty level	
Number of disabled participants	
Number of participants that are veterans	
Race of participants:	
• American Indian/Alaskan Native	
• Asian	
• African American	
• Hispanic/Latino American	
• Native Hawaiian/Other Pacific Islander	

2. Based upon the authorized distribution of SCSEP positions administered by your SCSEP project(s) are there any significantly under-served or over-served counties or communities in your service area? If so, please identify the county, counties, or communities.

3. Please describe any specific efforts undertaken by your SCSEP project(s) to increase program participation by individuals at or below poverty.

4. Please describe any specific efforts undertaken by your SCSEP project(s) to increase program participation by minority individuals.

5. What types of populations in your community most need Senior Community Service Employment Program services (e.g., disabled, veteran, etc.)? Please describe any specific efforts to serve these populations.

6. Please identify any of the following non-economic social need factors that may impact your SCSEP service population.   Include the estimated percentage of program participants in your current SCSEP project(s) that may be impacted by these potential need factors.

	Physical and/or mental disabilities
	Language barriers
	Cultural/ethnic/ social isolation
	Geographical isolation

7. Please identify the employment skills that are present in your current SCSEP participant populations. Estimate the percentage of current program participants with "unsubsidized job-ready" skills in the following areas:

Skill	Percentage
Basic Clerical	
Secretary	
Receptionist	
Administrative	
Customer Service	
Health Aides	
Companions	
Transportation	
Custodial	
Computer/Information Technology	
Library/Teachers/Tutors	
Food Service	
Security	
Child Care	
Other, please specify:	

8. Please identify the areas of employment training and skill-development provided by your SCSEP project(s) to SCSEP participants. Include the estimated percentage of SCSEP participants that received training in these areas in the current program year through December 31, 2003.

Position	Percentage
Basic Clerical	
Secretary	
Receptionist	
Administrative	
Customer Service	
Health Aides	
Companions	
Transportation	
Custodial	
Computer/Information Technology	
Library/Teachers/Tutors	
Food Service	
Security	
Child Care	
Other, please specify:	

9. What types of community service projects under SCSEP are most needed by the communities served by your SCSEP project(s)? (Check all that apply)

Services to General Community	YES	Services to Elder Community	YES
Education		Project Administration	
Health and Hospitals		Health or Home Care	
Housing/Home Rehabilitation		Housing/Home Rehabilitation	
Employment Assistance		Employment Assistance	
Recreation/Parks & Recreation		Recreation/Senior Centers	
Environmental Quality		Nutrition Programs	
Public Works		Transportation	
Social Service		Outreach and Referral	
Other, specify:		Other, specify:	

10. Do you have any recommendations for program improvement in the following areas:

    a) The distribution of SCSEP resources (e.g., authorized positions).

    b) The distribution of SCSEP resources to underserved areas of the state.

11. Please describe any recommendations for program improvement in other areas:

12. How would you characterize the level of coordination between your SCSEP project(s) and Workforce Investment Act (WIA) programs in your SCSEP service area? (Check the appropriate response)

	Close coordination between programs
	Some coordination between programs
	Little coordination between programs
	No coordination between programs

Please describe your response above:

13. Is your SCSEP project(s) involved in the One-Stop Career Centers in your SCSEP service area? (Check the most appropriate response)

	Involved in most One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area
	Involved in some One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area
	Involved in very few One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area
	Not involved in One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area

Please describe your response above:

14. Has your SCSEP project(s) entered into Memoranda of Understanding (MOUs) with One-Stop Career Centers in your SCSEP service area?

	MOUs with most One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area
	MOUs with some One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area
	MOUs with very few One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area
	No MOUS with One-Stop Career Centers in SCSEP service area

15. Please describe any specific efforts under way by your SCSEP projects(s) to coordinate with WIA programs.

16. Describe any obstacles to coordination with WIA programs.

17. Do you have suggestions for coordinated activities among SCSEP projects in the state (i.e., state and national sponsor organizations)?

18. Does your SCSEP project utilize Older Americans Act Section 502(e) experimental projects as a way to transition enrollees to unsubsidized employment (e.g., On-The-Job Training projects, Work Experience, etc)?

YES	NO

19. What percentage of your total unsubsidized placements through December 31, 2003 was placed through 502(e) arrangements?

Percentage	

20. Do you have any suggestions for the US Department of Labor to improve the 502(e) process?

SCSEP Equitable Distribution Report

Please fill in the current number of positions for your state and for each national grantee within your state. Totals and differences will calculate automatically. Adjust column widths as needed. (You may remove columns for national grantees that are not represented in your state.) Save the file and return a copy by e-mail to: gibson.gale@dol.gov

County	Distribution Factor	Equitable Share	State	AARP	EW	NCBA	NICOA	SER	SSA	USFS	Totals	Diff.
Alcona County, MI	0.0030	6			3					5	8	2
Alger County, MI	0.0017	3			3					6	9	6
Allegan County, MI	0.0096	19	3		11						14	-5
Alpena County, MI	0.0050	10	1		10						11	1
Antrim County, MI	0.0030	6	1		4						5	-1
Arenac County, MI	0.0028	6	1		5						6	0
Baraga County, MI	0.0018	4			4						4	0
Barry County, MI	0.0045	9		10							10	1
Bay County, MI	0.0131	26	20		8						28	2
Benzie County, MI	0.0019	4	2		4						6	2
Berrien County, MI	0.0206	41	14	32							46	5
Branch County, MI	0.0055	11			11						11	0
Calhoun County, MI	0.0169	34		33							33	-1
Cass County, MI	0.0059	12		11							11	-1
Charlevoix County, MI	0.0030	6	1		7						8	2
Cheboygan County, MI	0.0043	9	1		9						10	1
Chippewa County, MI	0.0056	11	1		1		3			7	12	1
Clare County, MI	0.0070	14	4		8						12	-2
Clinton County, MI	0.0052	11							10		10	-1
Crawford County, MI	0.0023	5	1		4						5	0
Delta County, MI	0.0063	13	2		3					10	15	2
Dickinson County, MI	0.0042	8			11						11	3
Eaton County, MI	0.0076	15							13		13	-2
Emmet County, MI	0.0039	8			6						6	-2
Genesee County, MI	0.0408	82	9				3		68		80	-2
Gladwin County, MI	0.0046	9	5		5						10	1
Gogebic County, MI	0.0041	8			3					9	12	4
Grand Traverse County, MI	0.0078	16	6		10						16	0
Gratiot County, MI	0.0075	15	1		9						10	-5
Hillsdale County, MI	0.0055	11	2		11						13	2
Houghton County, MI	0.0066	13	2		15						17	4
Huron County, MI	0.0066	13	2		9						11	-2
Ingham County, MI	0.0185	37	10				1		31		42	5
Ionia County, MI	0.0060	12	2		9						11	-1
Iosco County, MI	0.0053	11	1		3					6	10	-1
Iron County, MI	0.0034	7	2		3					5	10	3
Isabella County, MI	0.0050	10			10		2				12	2
Jackson County, MI	0.0164	33	11		22						33	0
Kalamazoo County, MI	0.0185	37	2		4						32	-5
Kalkaska County, MI	0.0024	5		32							6	1
Kent County, MI	0.0436	88	6	77							83	-5
Keweenaw County, MI	0.0004	1			2						2	1
Lake County, MI	0.0036	7			3					7	10	3
Lapeer County, MI	0.0075	15			9						9	-6
Leelanau County, MI	0.0019	4	2		3						5	1
Lenawee County, MI	0.0105	21	2			16					18	-3
Livingston County, MI	0.0061	12							9		9	-3
Luce County, MI	0.0013	3			2						2	-1
Mackinac County, MI	0.0021	4			1		2			5	8	4
Macomb County, MI	0.0654	131	29			28	2				59	-72
Manistee County, MI	0.0040	8			1		4			6	11	3

County	Distribution Factor	Equitable Share	State	AARP	EW	NCBA	NICOA	SER	SSA	USFS	Totals	Diff.
Marquette County, MI	0.0078	16			16						16	0
Mason County, MI	0.0041	8	2		7						9	1
Mecosta County, MI	0.0048	10			9						9	-1
Menominee County, MI	0.0047	10			11						11	1
Midland County, MI	0.0075	15	2		9						11	-4
Missaukee County, MI	0.0025	5			4						4	-1
Monroe County, MI	0.0124	25	9			13			2		24	-1
Montcalm County, MI	0.0072	15	3		12						15	0
Montmorency County, MI	0.0024	5	1		5						6	1
Muskegon County, MI	0.0196	39	27		11						38	-1
Newaygo County, MI	0.0069	14	2		6					6	14	0
Oakland County, MI	0.0730	147	26					50	56		132	-15
Oceana County, MI	0.0038	8			8						8	0
Ogemaw County, MI	0.0049	10			9						9	-1
Ontonagon County, MI	0.0017	4			3					8	11	7
Osceola County, MI	0.0037	7	3		5						8	1
Oscoda County, MI	0.0021	4			3					4	7	3
Otsego County, MI	0.0024	5	1		5						6	1
Ottawa County, MI	0.0146	29	2		17						19	-10
Presque Isle County, MI	0.0028	6			7						7	1
Roscommon County, MI	0.0051	10			9						9	-1
Saginaw County, MI	0.0241	48	23		17		7				47	-1
Sanilac County, MI	0.0161	32	5		9						14	-18
Schoolcraft County, MI	0.0078	16			3					7	10	-6
Shiawassee County, MI	0.0066	13			0				15		15	2
St Clair County, MI	0.0019	4	8		21						29	25
St Joseph County, MI	0.0068	14			11						11	-3
Tuscola County, MI	0.0063	13	2		9						11	-2
Van Buren County, MI	0.0101	20	4	19							23	3
Washtenaw County, MI	0.0152	30			2				25		27	-3
Wayne County, MI	0.2566	515	146	117		137	48	148			596	81
Wexford County, MI	0.0044	9								4	4	-5
TOTALS:	1.0000	2010	412	331*	474	194	72	198	229	95	2005	-5

Michigan Rural Population by County

County	Total Population	Total Rural Population	% Rural
Alcona County, Michigan	11,719	11,538	98.5%
Alger County, Michigan	9,862	9,862	100.0%
Allegan County, Michigan	105,665	74,273	70.3%
Alpena County, Michigan	31,314	16,103	51.4%
Antrim County, Michigan	23,110	23,110	100.0%
Arenac County, Michigan	17,269	17,269	100.0%
Baraga County, Michigan	8,746	8,746	100.0%
Barry County, Michigan	56,755	45,787	80.7%
Bay County, Michigan	110,157	32,110	29.1%
Benzie County, Michigan	15,998	15,998	100.0%
Berrien County, Michigan	162,453	49,333	30.4%
Branch County, Michigan	45,787	31,346	68.5%
Calhoun County, Michigan	137,985	41,823	30.3%
Cass County, Michigan	51,104	39,506	77.3%
Charlevoix County, Michigan	26,090	18,085	69.3%
Cheboygan County, Michigan	26,448	21,519	81.4%
Chippewa County, Michigan	38,543	17,242	44.7%
Clare County, Michigan	31,252	24,318	77.8%
Clinton County, Michigan	64,753	39,199	60.5%
Crawford County, Michigan	14,273	10,003	70.1%
Delta County, Michigan	38,520	17,403	45.2%
Dickinson County, Michigan	27,472	7,609	27.7%
Eaton County, Michigan	103,655	40,898	39.5%
Emmet County, Michigan	31,437	23,173	73.7%
Genesee County, Michigan	436,141	70,511	16.2%
Gladwin County, Michigan	26,023	23,305	89.6%
Gogebic County, Michigan	17,370	11,155	64.2%
Grand Traverse County, Michigan	77,654	39,297	50.6%
Gratiot County, Michigan	42,285	23,001	54.4%
Hillsdale County, Michigan	46,527	35,289	75.8%
Houghton County, Michigan	36,016	15,919	44.2%
Huron County, Michigan	36,079	32,094	89.0%
Ingham County, Michigan	279,320	37,021	13.3%
Ionia County, Michigan	61,518	35,200	57.2%
Iosco County, Michigan	27,339	15,678	57.3%
Iron County, Michigan	13,138	9,277	70.6%
Isabella County, Michigan	63,351	31,870	50.3%
Jackson County, Michigan	158,422	65,636	41.4%
Kalamazoo County, Michigan	238,603	47,551	19.9%
Kalkaska County, Michigan	16,571	13,764	83.1%
Kent County, Michigan	574,335	84,730	14.8%
Keweenaw County, Michigan	2,301	2,301	100.0%
Lake County, Michigan	11,333	11,333	100.0%

County	Total Population	Total Rural Population	% Rural
Lapeer County, Michigan	87,904	66,866	76.1%
Leelanau County, Michigan	21,119	20,064	95.0%
Lenawee County, Michigan	98,890	53,640	54.2%
Livingston County, Michigan	156,951	60,834	38.8%
Luce County, Michigan	7,024	3,772	53.7%
Mackinac County, Michigan	11,943	9,218	77.2%
Macomb County, Michigan	788,149	25,447	3.2%
Manistee County, Michigan	24,527	14,530	59.2%
Marquette County, Michigan	64,634	27,108	41.9%
Mason County, Michigan	28,274	18,476	65.3%
Mecosta County, Michigan	40,553	28,780	71.0%
Menominee County, Michigan	25,326	16,091	63.5%
Midland County, Michigan	82,874	37,545	45.3%
Missaukee County, Michigan	14,478	14,478	100.0%
Monroe County, Michigan	145,945	54,090	37.1%
Montcalm County, Michigan	61,266	50,739	82.8%
Montmorency County, Michigan	10,315	10,315	100.0%
Muskegon County, Michigan	170,200	44,465	26.1%
Newaygo County, Michigan	47,874	39,652	82.8%
Oakland County, Michigan	1,194,156	61,148	5.1%
Oceana County, Michigan	26,873	26,873	100.0%
Ogemaw County, Michigan	21,645	21,645	100.0%
Ontonagon County, Michigan	7,818	7,818	100.0%
Osceola County, Michigan	23,197	20,616	88.9%
Oscoda County, Michigan	9,418	9,418	100.0%
Otsego County, Michigan	23,301	15,523	66.6%
Ottawa County, Michigan	238,314	56,681	23.8%
Presque Isle County, Michigan	14,411	11,322	78.6%
Roscommon County, Michigan	25,469	14,375	56.4%
Saginaw County, Michigan	210,039	64,165	30.5%
St. Clair County, Michigan	164,235	62,021	37.8%
St. Joseph County, Michigan	62,422	34,964	56.0%
Sanilac County, Michigan	44,547	38,594	86.6%
Schoolcraft County, Michigan	8,903	5,231	58.8%
Shiawassee County, Michigan	71,687	39,034	54.5%
Tuscola County, Michigan	58,266	46,616	80.0%
Van Buren County, Michigan	76,263	55,617	72.9%
Washtenaw County, Michigan	322,895	56,432	17.5%
Wayne County, Michigan	2,061,162	14,208	0.7%
Wexford County, Michigan	30,484	19,324	63.4%
State	**9,938,444**	**2,518,920**	**25.3%**

Source: 2000 US Census

Michigan Poverty Rates by County

Count Name	% Individuals 55 and Older Below Poverty	County Name	% Individuals 55 and Older Below Poverty
Alcona County, Michigan	10.9%	Lenawee County, Michigan	9.0%
Alger County, Michigan	9.2%	Livingston County, Michigan	3.8%
Allegan County, Michigan	7.7%	Luce County, Michigan	11.2%
Alpena County, Michigan	9.0%	Mackinac County, Michigan	8.2%
Antrim County, Michigan	7.5%	Macomb County, Michigan	6.1%
Arenac County, Michigan	9.2%	Manistee County, Michigan	9.5%
Baraga County, Michigan	11.1%	Marquette County, Michigan	7.6%
Barry County, Michigan	5.5%	Mason County, Michigan	8.1%
Bay County, Michigan	8.9%	Mecosta County, Michigan	9.7%
Benzie County, Michigan	5.9%	Menominee County, Michigan	11.0%
Berrien County, Michigan	9.4%	Midland County, Michigan	8.2%
Branch County, Michigan	7.7%	Missaukee County, Michigan	11.4%
Calhoun County, Michigan	10.1%	Monroe County, Michigan	8.2%
Cass County, Michigan	9.0%	Montcalm County, Michigan	10.3%
Charlevoix County, Michigan	6.6%	Montmorency County, Michigan	9.6%
Cheboygan County, Michigan	9.2%	Muskegon County, Michigan	8.9%
Chippewa County, Michigan	11.0%	Newaygo County, Michigan	10.9%
Clare County, Michigan	13.4%	Oakland County, Michigan	5.8%
Clinton County, Michigan	5.3%	Oceana County, Michigan	11.3%
Crawford County, Michigan	10.1%	Ogemaw County, Michigan	12.2%
Delta County, Michigan	10.5%	Ontonagon County, Michigan	10.3%
Dickinson County, Michigan	8.9%	Osceola County, Michigan	11.2%
Eaton County, Michigan	5.3%	Oscoda County, Michigan	11.3%
Emmet County, Michigan	8.0%	Otsego County, Michigan	7.5%
Genesee County, Michigan	9.1%	Ottawa County, Michigan	4.5%
Gladwin County, Michigan	9.4%	Presque Isle County, Michigan	10.8%
Gogebic County, Michigan	11.2%	Roscommon County, Michigan	7.5%
Grand Traverse County, Michigan	6.7%	Saginaw County, Michigan	9.8%
Gratiot County, Michigan	10.7%	St. Clair County, Michigan	8.0%
Hillsdale County, Michigan	8.5%	St. Joseph County, Michigan	8.8%
Houghton County, Michigan	14.1%	Sanilac County, Michigan	10.2%
Huron County, Michigan	10.6%	Schoolcraft County, Michigan	9.4%
Ingham County, Michigan	7.9%	Shiawassee County, Michigan	7.2%
Ionia County, Michigan	9.1%	Tuscola County, Michigan	8.4%
Iosco County, Michigan	9.3%	Van Buren County, Michigan	12.4%
Iron County, Michigan	9.0%	Washtenaw County, Michigan	5.8%
Isabella County, Michigan	7.8%	Wayne County, Michigan	13.1%
Jackson County, Michigan	6.4%	Wexford County, Michigan	10.0%
Kalamazoo County, Michigan	6.6%	**State**	**8.7%**
Kalkaska County, Michigan	9.3%		
Kent County, Michigan	7.6%	Source: 2000 US Census	
Keweenaw County, Michigan	13.4%		
Lake County, Michigan	15.9%		
Lapeer County, Michigan	7.5%		
Leelanau County, Michigan	4.8%		

<u>2003-04 Michigan Senior Community Service Employment Program Sponsors</u>

AARP Foundation
Experience Works!, Inc.
Michigan Office of Services to the Aging
National Caucus & Center on Black Aged, Inc.
National Indian Council on Aging
SER – Jobs for Progress National, Inc.
Senior Service America, Inc.
USDA – Forest Service